

language? Okay. This says that a plan's sponsor shall be a member of the Nebraska Property and Liability Insurance Guaranty Association, and if that's the case, it is a major reversal of public policy. Remember that the employer is not an insurance company. We're not an insurance company, and guaranty associations are for the insurance companies. Why? Because they use the premium tax as their way of paying off their liabilities under the guaranty fund responsibility. The guaranty fund has a board that operates it. It has a membership and some oversight. It has an association with its fellow members. The insurance companies do not want cities and schools to be part of this Guaranty Association, but that portion of these programs which is, in fact, excess insurance will be covered by the Guaranty Association. The only portion that's not covered by the Guaranty Association is that amount of deductible paid for by the district or the city on behalf of the employee and that amount of money has a 100 percent of it set aside in a separate aggregate account for the purpose of covering these expected costs. No insurance company meets that kind of standard. That's a higher standard than any insurance company, but all I can tell you is that this is a classic oranges and apples battle by forcing into the Guaranty Association people that aren't insurance companies, who don't pay premium tax, whose mechanisms for paying off the other losses of the guaranty fund don't exist. Are you, in the event a health insurance company goes down, going to levy an assessment against every city who happens to be part of this having been forced into this Guaranty Association to pay that without the will of the local district, the board of a school district or a city council because it's an assessment from the Guaranty Fund Association? There are a bogging number of constitutional difficulties, in my estimation, by taking away from cities that kind of decision making. It's certainly possible for us to do it with respect to the insurance, the regulation of insurance, but they're not creatures of the state in the same way the schools that cities are that have constitutional responsibilities. All I'm saying is that where we have a 100 percent of the expected claims in a pot standing alone, a standard that no insurance company can meet, there is no sensible reason to drag cities and schools into the Guaranty Fund Association which doesn't fit their needs, which can bind them in a way that none of us have been thinking about constitutionally and which can then obligate them to pay off the losses of a Blue Cross/Blue Shield, should that ever go under, or a Mutual of Omaha, not for their losses, but for the losses